



31
March 29, 1999

by hand

Theodore J. Kaczynski
04475-046
P.O. Box 8500
Florence, CO 81226-8500

Dear Ted,

I received letters 42-44 today. As there is much to respond to, I shall get right to it.

(p. 1, ¶ 1) The reference to "Mello's call" took place some time ago, when you had suggested that Mello act as a transmitter of information with regard to Waits. Mello has not told me what the lie was either. I believe he no longer speaks to Waits. Before I forget, I have seen Sallinger's story now (on video). At one point, there is a close-up of a photocopied page from your journal. An FBI Laboratory stamp is clearly visible.

(¶ 2-3; p. 8, ¶ 3) I would be interested in talking to Fishler about the possibility of a documentary. I still think it is a good idea. Bear in mind that he is most likely very interested in conducting the first interview with you. Documentary filmmakers are indeed members of the media in general, no matter if they are less ideologically conformist and morally polluted. This should not be taken out of context. Fischler and Sucher are no doubt earnest in their desire to portray your story as honestly as possible. But they may also be earnest about making sure they can get a large number of viewers by boasting that they have the first interview with Ted Kaczynski. That should be self-evident. Also: Mello tells me that Fischler opined that the *60 Minutes* appearance might be a good thing when they spoke late last year (I do not recall exactly when conversation occurred).

I should add that my opinion is not terribly canted by the fact that Sucher's assistant behaved in an under-handed manner when "checking me out," but there may be a tinge of that in my response. It is also true that an interview on *60 Minutes* would increase sales. Public opinion would certainly change were you to have a bestseller (roughly 100,000 copies sold in six months). I have wrested a good deal of control from *60 Minutes*, all of which enforceable by a binding agreement. Bonnie is currently firming up the language. I'm enclosing a copy for your perusal, but think it best that this waits until after the appeal is filed. Finally, your comments on Gordon are fair: *ergo* the binding agreement.

(¶ 4) Line-edit samples enclosed.

(¶ 5) I am going to be publishing Jensen's book *A Language Older than Words* in Summer/Fall 2000. The book does need some work, and he has been very willing to work with me on it. I am most concerned with instances in the mss where he allows his emotions to get the better of the intellect. I told him this once, but found that the manner in which I put it to him was unsuccessful, since it placed him on the defensive. We have since arrived at a rapport that will facilitate the work ahead, and I am optimistic. He has much of value, and can accept constructive, empowering critique. There is work ahead, but I admire both Derrick and his book, so it is almost like not working at all.

(p.2, ¶ 2) I would be wrong-headed to contend with your argument regarding the practical implementation of changed values, and would add that I know it happens this way more often than not. I thought you gave the illustration under the aegis of Jensen, and the paragraph that you are commenting on here, somewhat short shrift. I have an aversion to violence whether it be the sprawling "Idiodyssey" currently under way in Kosovo or violence of a more particular gestalt. Having said that (and I do not mean to trivialize here), I also have an aversion to shaving, although I generally perform the operation once or twice a week.* That was of course vague and figurative, so it is better to say that at this point I am neither a radical activist nor a revolutionary, unless my particular brand of publishing can be considered a form of activism. I do sympathize with particular radicals and revolutionaries to varying degrees. What I admire is the active defense of strong (i.e., to my way of thinking correct) principles and those who defend and/or try to implement them, and I strive for this in my chosen occupation as a publisher.

(¶ 3) I am not *certain* that there are no other works for the guitar other than the transcription by John Williams that I have already mentioned to you. His music would be very well suited to the guitar. I don't suppose the prison would let me visit, much less allow me to bring a guitar. It would be great to play for you, and I would try my best to brush off the rust before doing so.

(¶ 4) The letter to which I was referring was indeed dated January 29. It was in a large envelope marked # 34. There was the addition of unfamiliar handwriting that indicated that the envelope *had* been sealed. I take it there is a suspected perpetrator hear, who is perhaps a scatterbrain...

(¶ 5; p.3 ¶ 1) Vain as it is, that caricature does not really look all that much like me, and I felt what I assume many Jews did when confronted with Nazi propaganda. I'll send you a snapshot if ever you think that worth doing. As for pumping iron, therein lies a tale. After graduating from Bennington College during the year before Oxford, I worked as a stone mason in Amsterdam. I swung a fifteen-pound mallet eight hours a day and moved large pieces of church around. It put some muscle on my hitherto stringy frame. Nowadays, I bike to work on nice days and go to the

* I appreciated your addition about bathing, since I am a little water-averse. William Wordsworth, and the rest of his nineteenth-century contemporaries, never bathed during the winter months. They believed that essential oils were washed away, which made it easier for the ague to enter the bodies.

gym sometimes to lift weights. I like to stay fit and somewhat strong. One never knows what the contingencies of life will bring. Smoking of course negates my goals to some extent.

(¶ 2) I wish you would let me use that comment made by the prison shrink, but I will never do it without your permission (*but it is very tempting!*). I apologize for not putting it more strongly in the letter. But it is not that I succumbed pell-mell to the authority of a court document, rather than claiming what I thought myself. Having said this, I also know that had I made an unsubstantiated remark it would have been ridiculed by the media, and the whole point is to get the media to put a less negative spin on you and your book. I am in the practice of relating to people my experience of you from our correspondence, which I describe as matter-of-fact, pleasant, and sometimes very witty. (¶ 3) I agree with what you have to say here with regard to defense teams, *et al*, or more accurately, it is also my opinion.

(¶ 5; p. 4, ¶ 1-3) I regret having used the word "fuck" when relating the joke to Eileen. She did however forgive me, at least when she was talking to me. She has also called me again to find out why I had said that Jim Brooke's story did not bother me entirely, which I have already explained to you. Eileen and I had a perfectly respectable conversation, although I am not sure she understood my point of view entirely. I assume your lack of comment means that my joke fell flat. I want you to know that when I realized my mistake with Eileen, I apologized profusely. She is more capable of abstraction than . . . or ' . . . and I have discussed all of them, and she seems to feel the same way I do. I also think that . . . may be loose cannons (to revisit a term) since they are reacting to Waits in an entirely emotional, "small-town West" manner. Joy is very sharp, and will make the perfect plenipotentiary. The stories by . . . , the Lundbergs, will be carefully edited. I hope something worthwhile comes in.

(¶ 4) I put the onus of checking citations on Mello, and assume he did so both in general and particularly before he lost the ABA article. I am going to look into the matter tomorrow.

(¶ 6-7) I prefer Ted Kaczynski. It is the manner in which people with whom I have discussed you work most often refer to you. I do not think it is too informal for your book or anything else you pen, but then I have a dislike for things that are overly formal. It seems we are deferring to each other here, so if you would like to use Theodore J. Kaczynski, please tell me and it is as good as done. Thank you for the samples. By the way, Paul Davis is out. He lied to me about his rates. He asked for \$5000 after offering to design your book for free. I have not spoken to him since. Your jacket will be designed by Susan Carroll or Chip Kidd. They both work at Knopf.

(p. 5, ¶ 3; p. 9, ¶ 2) I would think a Spanish translation might be a very welcome element in the proposed book project. If you have a particular translator in mind, let me know. I know several. It should be translated again. I would like to have letters if they are (a) extremely intelligent or (b) mediocre-to-competent (but appreciative) by noted scholars who may raise a few brows among the establishment. I also want you to write commentary on various points that have either been misunderstood or criticized in a manner that might beg an intelligent response.

I also think that an essay on the signification of the term technology might be useful. In the Greek, *tekhnologia* signifies a systematic treatment. In this sense, the text of the manifesto would work against itself (much like your joke about Goodenough suing you for copyright infringement and then defending you *pro bono*). But the term also signifies applied science, which is how it figures in the text. Unless I am mistaken, *tekhnē* means simply art, or artifice. So, technology is essentially the use of art or artifice to achieve a (productive or destructive) goal. A lever is an example of technology as I understand it. The advent of the lever was not intrinsically dangerous to individual freedom, but it can be understood as a rung in the scaffold surrounding the tower of Babel that is modern technology. As the manifesto says: "The 'Bad' Parts Of Technology Cannot Be Separated From The 'Good' Parts." I would like to see someone spell this out more specifically for readers. I imagine the piece would discuss technology and civilization, Jacques Ellul's ideas with regard to this, etc.

The main elements of interest are your commentary, the letters to *The New York Times* and *Scientific American* and various correspondence that is distinguished and will foster a better understanding of the material. It might also be interesting to include antagonistic letters and then have you (or someone else) respond.

(p. 5, ¶ 4; p. 6, ¶ 1) I regret to say that I am unable to frank this particular correspondence with a New Guinea one-cent stamp, since Bonnie will be delivering it by hand. I do have some nice rooster one-cent stamps, and will try to remember to affix one to the next letter! I look forward to seeing Lydia's drawing.

(¶ 2) Context Media comprises one-half of my business. It is a separate service-oriented division that creates foreign language editions of educational material (on wildlife, cooking, gardening) for other publishing houses. It is a source of revenue for Context Books, which is the other half of the company referred to as Simulacrum, which does nothing but house the above two entities (see first line of your contract).

(¶ 3- end of letter) Reading your comments about the media, I am reminded of the lapsed-Marxist Herbert Marcuse. As a teenager, I admired his work on repressive tolerance. Repressive tolerance signifies the phenomenon of neutered threat in modern society. By neutered threat (my expressionistic term) I mean to say that society in general, and the media in particular, tolerates certain ideas not because they are acceptable, but because, if no one "flinches," society will most likely survive the threat, much like a game of ideological chicken, or parents who ignore their willful child. You might liken society's reaction to dangerous ideological elements to the hiker who is faced by a protective mother bear with her cubs. If he doesn't panic, and assiduously avoids the mama bear's charge, she may simmer down (although she may also tear him limb from limb). Of course radicals never lose interest in their values and beliefs, but with the passage of time people do cease to feel threatened by those ideas, and the radicals who espouse them. An example can be found in the Black Panther devolution into urban hip, rap music, etc that turned racial hatred and separatism into a multimillion-dollar industry. That is a very thin Marcusean nutshell.

What is interesting with regard to your situation is that Marcuse proved to be dead wrong. Apparently your ideas are too distressing for most people. I have had friends lash out at me because of my association with you. Literary agents shun me for the most part. They have a strong negative reaction. It should be said that no one has escaped from a serious discussion about this without an altered opinion and a more balanced understanding. I have also noticed subtle shifts, as I mentioned in my last letter, with regard to the manner in which stories about you are rendered. Whether you agree or not, I still insist for example that you received decent treatment at the hands of Brooke. Sure, he left very important information out, but consider how much worse it could have been. Also, you have no idea what he handed in. It could have been edited into its final, biased form. Editors are often the real culprits of distortion and inaccuracy.

Consider also that *USA Today* ran a story about you that did not contain the word Unabomber in the title. Although it may not be readily apparent, this is one of the reasons why I would like to use "Ted" instead of "Theodore." By calling you the Unabomber, the media portray a dehumanized, characterless person who is evil because he murdered people for reasons that they may not understand entirely. By giving you a name that is not terribly uncommon, and soon a story to go along with it, you become more human. By calling you a radical environmentalist, and an activist, you become more fathomable. It is easy to hate an abstraction. It is hard not to countenance an individual, no matter what you may think of him. My job is to create a *publicly* "humanized" version of you, one that has been entered into the annals of time *by the media* as well as historians equipped with all of the information to do their jobs correctly. It might be put this way: everyone knows who the Unabomber is, but very few know who Ted Kaczynski is.

Journalists are no doubt self-censoring. They are the conduit-pipe for the dominant paradigms that inform a society's ideological mores. It is no different anywhere in the world. Politics, democracy, freedom have no bearing on the subtle maneuvers that characterize the (often unconscious, Althusser called it false-conscious) machinations of contemporary media. I agree that it gains its strength from organic integrity, much like the phragmytis (sp?) weed. It is no coincidence that most journalists come from Ivy-League schools. They are the guards at the gates of civilization. That much is clear. They have been well trained. They have passed muster with those who have put them in the position to "report" the world we live in, and they are dense when it comes to realizing it all. But to understand this, to see what particular form of false consciousness happens to be dictating their reactions, is to be able to get them to shift a little. I have never gotten a good story from a newspaper without having an involved argument with the reporter on the job. If you could write a book about this, and get into the vapor trail of ideology at work as only a rationalist could do (successfully), I would publish it in a heartbeat.

The newspaper article with comments by Linda Patrik was published by *The New York Post* on February 23. I will enter this where you have indicated on the addition.

I will write a query to Green Anarchist in London. Thank you for the address. Be well.

Yours,
Edan.

b led 3.31.99

Note on sample line-edit:

I have tried to be as light-handed as possible.

Text w/ a line drawn above it indicates an edit.


new word
word is self-explanatory

2
word indicates a suggested deletion.

"stet" means nevermind.

~~B~~ means that this character should be lower-case.

word,  indicates a deletion (here: ; -> ,)

 insert comma

⊙ full stop

INTRODUCTION

A FRIEND says there are a lot of people who mistake their imagination for their memory. ¹

Daily Oklahoman

I am very different from the kind of person that the media have portrayed with the help of my brother and my mother. The purpose of this book is to show that I am not as I have been described in the media, to exhibit the truth about my relationship with my family, and to explain why my brother and my mother have lied about me.

In fairness I should acknowledge that my brother and mother probably are not fully conscious of many of their own lies, since they both are adept at talking themselves into believing what they want to believe. Yet at least some of their lies must be conscious, as we shall see later.

I consider it demeaning to expose one's private life to public view. But the media have already taken away my privacy, and there is no way I can refute the falsehoods that have been propagated about me except by discussing publicly some of the most intimate aspects of my own life and that of my family.

Ever since my early teens, my immediate family has been a millstone around my neck. I've often wondered how I had the bad luck to be born into such a nest of fools. My relations with them have been to me a constant source of irritation and disgust -- and sometimes of very serious pain. For some forty years my brother and mother to satisfy their own selfish needs leaned heavily on me for the satisfaction of certain needs of theirs; they were psychological leeches. They loved me because they needed me, but at the same time

they hated me because I didn't give them the psychological sustenance they ^{sought to} were ^{Perhaps they} ^{whatever the case may be,} ² looking for; and they must have sensed my contempt for them. Thus their feelings toward me were, and remain, strongly conflicting. In my brother's case the conflict is extreme.

I certainly can't claim that my own role in the ² life of my family has been a noble ^{reason to resent} one. I had good justification for resenting my parents, but instead of making a clean break with them in early adulthood, as I should have done, I maintained relations ² with ² them: ^I sometimes ^{and} was kind to them, ^I sometimes ^{we} used them, ² sometimes ² squabbled with ² them over relatively minor matters, ^{and} ^I sometimes ^I hurt their feelings intentionally. ^I occasionally wrote ² them emotional letters ^{to them} expressing my bitterness over the way they ^{when I was younger} had treated me and the way they had exploited my talents to satisfy their own needs. With my brother too I should have broken off early in life. The relationship wasn't good for either of us, but it was much worse for my brother than it was for me. This is a complicated matter that I will deal with at length further on.

This book is carefully documented. It has to be because otherwise the reader would not know whether to believe my account or ^{those} that of my brother and mother. Due to the continual need to quote documents and argue facts, the writing is ^{sometimes} dry and perhaps pedantic. All the same, I think ^{there is much of} the book will attract many readers because of ² the intrinsic ^{here} human interest of its content.

The amount of material about me that has appeared in the media is enormous, and I have not read or seen more than a small fraction of it. Apart from some straightforward reports of legal maneuvers or courtroom proceedings, most of what I have seen

is loaded with errors and distortions, some of them trivial, some of them very serious indeed. Due to limitations on my own time, energy, and resources, the documents I've studied in preparing this book include from the media only a few items; principally the articles on my case that appeared in *Newsweek*, *Time*, *U.S. News and World Report*, and *People* on April 15th and 22, 1996; ^{I also discuss} the "quickie" books that appeared within a few weeks after my arrest, *Mad Genius* and *Unabomber*; the articles based on interviews with my brother and mother that appeared in the *New York Times*, May 26, 1996, in the *Washington Post*, June 16, 1996, in the *Sacramento Bee*, January 19, 1997; and my mother's and brother's appearance on *60 Minutes*, September 15, 1996. The latter cover all of the public statements about me made by my brother and my mother that ² have bearing on this book. have seen up to the present date, March 5, 1998. (Added April 1, 1998: I've recently ² been reminded of some other remarks by my brother, brief ones that have appeared in ² various newspapers, but I don't think they contained anything that I need to address in ² this book.)

Apart from the published sources, I cite a large number of unpublished documents. It will of course be necessary at some point to make these documents accessible for examination, ² so that it can be verified that I have cited them accurately. But I don't expect to do this immediately on publication of this book. For one thing, some of the documents are still legally sensitive, and for another, I don't want journalists rummaging through my papers to get material for sensational articles. The documents probably will be housed in the Labadie Collection of the University of Michigan Library, and arrangements will be made so that some responsible and

unbiased party can examine them and verify that I have cited them correctly and have not unfairly taken any passage out of context. Eventually some of the documents may be published. In any case, I will make every effort to see that the accuracy of my citations can be independently verified at the earliest possible time.

I also make use in this book of a few reports received orally from investigators who worked for my defense team. The investigators do not want their names revealed because the resulting publicity about them might interfere with their work ^{as} on future cases. ² investigators. ² But ² at some point I ^{hope} expect to make arrangements so that the ² investigators can be consulted discreetly and ^{to} confirm the oral information that they gave me. (But see below for my remarks on the reliability of this information.) In this book I refer to the investigators as Investigator #1, Investigator #2, etc.

Similar remarks apply to the psychologist whom I call Dr. K.

Needless to say, I am not able to provide documentary evidence to refute all of the false statements that have been made about me, or even all of those that have

been made by my brother and my mother. But I am able to demonstrate that many people who make to the media lied about me were ² in certain other ² informants have been lying or mistaken in enough cases to show that statements ^{They} made about me ^{cannot} are so unreliable that they should not be given any credence unless they are ² thoroughly documented corroborated by documents written at or near the time to which they refer.

In many cases I cite documents written by myself -- principally my journals, some autobiographical notes, and letters sent to my family. All of these were written at a time (prior to my arrest) when I had no motive to lie about the points that are now at issue. They were either seized by the FBI when they searched my cabin, or were in the

People
custody of other persons at the time of my arrest. Since my arrest I have not had physical possession of any of these documents: I have worked ^{solely} from Xerox copies. Thus there can be no question of my having fabricated any of this material for the purposes of this book. ^{with one} Exception: Notes that I took on information given to me orally by the investigators and by Dr. K. ^{These} were of course written after my arrest and while I was preparing this book. Moreover, some of these documents, especially my 1979 autobiography, contain highly embarrassing admissions that show that I ^{have striven/-d} was striving to be as honest as possible. Some of the documents were written almost immediately after the events that they record; others, while not ^{contemporary} with the events, were written many years ago when my memory of the events was ^{still relatively fresh} fresher, and hence they presumably provide more reliable evidence than someone else's recollections taken down within the last year or two.

In many cases, I make use of sources of information that I know to be unreliable, ^{fairly straight forward} such as media reports. The rationale for doing this is ^{that} if the reader has conceived a certain impression of me from unreliable sources, and if I can show by quoting those same sources that the ^{impression} is not to be trusted, then I will at any rate have demonstrated that the sources ^{were} are unreliable and hence that the reader has no reason to believe them. As for statements of my brother and my mother that were quoted in the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and the *Sacramento Bee*, my mother and brother presumably saw the articles based on their interviews, and, as far as I know, ² they never wrote letters to the newspapers in question correcting any errors, so they have to be considered responsible for their statements as quoted in the articles.

In all cases when I have felt that a source was more or less unreliable, I have warned the reader of that fact in the Notes on Documents.

Quite apart from the unreliability of the media, I was appalled to learn how few people provided trustworthy information. A psychologist (Dr. K.) repeatedly interviewed my brother, my mother, and me. She gave me orally some items of information obtained from my brother, mother, and aunt, and I wrote these down at the time. But when I asked her to confirm some items of this information several months later, in three cases out of a total of nine she either said she couldn't remember any such information and couldn't find it in her notes, or she reworded the information in such a way as to change its meaning significantly.²¹ Other shrinks misquoted me or gave

either not seriously or being correct similar, being negligent... ^{*inaccurate*} seriously incorrect information in their reports. The investigators who worked for my defense team were much more reliable than the shrinks, but they too gave me orally a few items of information that they later had to correct, not because they had learned something new from further investigation but because they had reported to me carelessly in the first place. For this reason I have tried to rely as little as possible on information received orally. Wherever I have used such information the reader is made aware of it either in the text or in a footnote, and he or she is advised to receive such information with caution. I have cited oral information from Dr. K. or the investigators in only a few cases. It is possible that Dr. K. or the investigators may decline to confirm some of this information if they are asked. Yet I was careful in recording the information and I am certain that I have accurately reported what I was told.

you've already said this info, was given orally

What really horrified me, though, was the nonsense reported to the media or to

Scare quotes may be appropriate

the investigators by people who "knew" me years or decades ago. The investigators have given me written reports of interviews conducted with approximately 150 people.^{3/} Some of the information obtained in these interviews dealt with matters of which I have no knowledge, hence I am unable to give an opinion of its accuracy. Taking into consideration only matters of which I have knowledge and speaking in rough terms, I can say that something like 14% of the informants gave reports the accuracy of which I was unable to judge; 6% gave reports about whose accuracy I was doubtful; 6% gave reports that were inaccurate in detail but provided an overall picture of me that was not far from the truth; 36% gave reports that were fairly accurate; 38% gave reports that were seriously inaccurate; and, of these last, eleven ^{people} persons gave reports that were so ^a base ^{could only be called} far off that they were mere flights of fancy. More than that: of the reports that were fairly accurate, 72% were brief (one and a half pages or less); while fewer than one in four of the seriously inaccurate reports were brief. So it seems that people who spoke carefully and responsibly usually didn't have much ^a information to ^{say} give, while most of those who had (or thought they had) a good deal of information didn't know what they were talking about. (I was told that under normal circumstances the investigators would have interviewed the subjects over and over in order to separate the wheat from the chaff, but for some reason this was not done in my case.)
^{Based on what} To judge from what I have seen ^a of them, statements about me made to ^a journalists by people who knew me, ^a as quoted in the media, were even more inaccurate than what was reported to my investigators.

In some cases I have documentary evidence that shows that reports about me

are false, but in the great majority of cases I am relying on memory for the information that disproves the reports. Why do I assume, when my recollections disagree with someone else's, that mine are usually right?

2
First: In many cases I can be ^{fairly} confident that I am right simply because I am in a better position to know about the matter in question than 2 people are the persons whose memories disagree with mine. For instance, if someone says that I used to wear a plaid sport-jacket four decades ago, I can safely assume that he has me mixed up with someone else, because I have owned very few sport-jackets in my life and I know that I 2 have never had a plaid one.

2 In addition to this, there is
Second: I have good evidence of the accuracy of my long-term memory. ^{4/}

run-in 2
(A) Investigators working for my defense team who researched my past told me repeatedly that my long-term memory was remarkably sharp and accurate. ^{5/} This does not mean that I *never* made mistakes of memory, but that I did so seldom. (See *ital.* Appendix 11.)

2 I
(B) In preparing this book I've studied hundreds of old family letters ^{6/} that my mother had saved, going all the way back to 1957, and I've found 2 hardly anything to ^{was seldom surprised} surprise me: to the extent that the matters covered in the letters overlapped with areas of which I have memories, my memories were confirmed with only minor discrepancies.

2 9 2
(C) During the 1990's, 2 for reasons that I need not take the trouble to explain 2 here, I obtained from Harvard a transcript of my record. Before looking at it, as a check on my memory, I wrote down on a sheet of paper the number-designations of the courses I took (e.g., "Math 1a") and the grades I got in them. The FBI found this sheet *ital.*

of paper in my cabin and I have a copy of it. ²⁷ Here is how it compares with the official transcripts ²⁸ of my record:

General Education AHF (which everyone referred to as "Gen Ed A"), Humanities 5, and Social Sciences 7 were courses lasting two semesters; all other courses were of one semester.

nt. would you be willing to mention that a grade differential exists between the 50s + the 90s (e.g., B ≠ F)

Official Transcript

My Memory (I know this to be true.)

General Education AHF (mid-year grade)	B-	Gen Ed A mid-year grade not remembered	
German R	A	German R	A
Mathematics 1a	A	Math 1a	A
Humanities 5 (mid-year)	C	Hum 5	C
Social Sciences 7 (mid-year)	C	Soc Sci 7	C
General Education AHF	C	Gen Ed A	C+
Physics 12a	A	Physics 12a	A
Mathematics 1b	A	Math 1b	A
Humanities 5	C+	Hum 5	C+
Social sciences 7	B-	Soc Sci 7	B-
Anthropology 1a	B+	Anthro 1a	B+
German Da	B	Germ Da	B
Mathematics 20a	A	Math 20a	A
Physics 12c	C	Phys. 12c	C-
Anthropology 10	B+	Anthro 10	B+
Astronomy 2	B+	Astron 2	B
Mathematics 20b	B	Math 20b	B
Mathematics 101	C	Math 101	C+
History 109a	B-	History	B-
Mathematics 105a	A-	Math 105a	A-
Mathematics 106a	A	Math 106a	A
Philosophy 140	A	Phil 140	A
History 109b	C-	History	C-
Mathematics 105b	C+	Math 105b	C+
Mathematics 106b	A-	Math 106b	A-

Philosophy 141	B	Phil 141	B+
History of Science 101	B+	Hist Sci 101	B+
Humanities 115	B-	Hum (Ren) ^{9/}	C+
Mathematics 212a	B	Math 212a	B+
Mathematics 250a	B	Math 250a	B
Anthropology 122	A-	Anthro (hum gen) ^{10/}	A-
History 143	C+	Eng intel hist ^{11/}	C+
Mathematics 212b	A	Math 212b	A
Scandinavian 50	A-	Scand 50	A-

As far as I can recall, I never saw a transcript of my Harvard grades from the time I left Harvard in 1962 until I wrote them down from memory in the early 1990's.

²
(D) (Sing.) In the other surviving documents I have found reasonably good agreement with my memories. When I have encountered a discrepancy between my memory of a particular memories and someone else's memory as reported in the media or to my investigators, and when some document was available that resolved the discrepancy, the discrepancy has ²
always been resolved in my favor, with very few exceptions. ^{12/} ⁹ (However, I can think of two cases -- one trivial, one significant -- in which my memory has disagreed with someone else's and I am sure that the other person is right because the matter is one about which she could hardly be mistaken. ^{13/} Also, when I recall things that I have read years previously in books and magazines, it is not uncommon for my memory of what I have read to be distorted; occasionally it is seriously wrong. ^{14/} On the other hand, my memory of things I have written or read in personal letters or heard in conversation seems to be pretty reliable, so far as surviving documents have made it possible to judge.)

In further support of my argument,

Third: ^{w/ regard to} There is abundant evidence of the gross unreliability of the memories of

me that have been reported to my investigators or have appeared in the media. In reference to the information given to the investigators, Investigator #2, who is very experienced, writes:

en-in
to extract
(der 5 lines)

"Lay witness reports of Ted's behavior and functioning are extremely suspect given the high profile nature of his case. Many of their anecdotes and conclusions are most likely the result of planted memories and suggestions they've read, seen, or heard from others." ^{15/}

There are three ways by which I have been able to establish that many reports are wrong. They may contradict information about which I am in a position to know so well that there is hardly any chance that my own memory could be mistaken; they may contradict convincing documentary evidence; or the accounts of two different people may contradict one another, so that at least one of them must be wrong.

Throughout this book the reader will find examples of reports that are proved wrong. But it will be useful to give some examples here ² in the Introduction also, because, among other things, they will illustrate some of the ways in which false memories or false reports arise.

Some of the sources of falsehood or distortion can be identified with reasonable confidence: (a) Media planting. The informant "remembers" something ^{reported} because it has ² been suggested to him by the media. (b) Mistaken identity. The informant has me mixed up with someone else. (c) ^{Recent memory} Remembering later years. The informant remembers the later years of his association with me, largely forgets the earlier ones, and attributes to the earlier years the same traits, relationships, or circumstances that existed in the

later years. (d) Stereotyping. The informant sees that I have some of the traits of a given group, so he identifies me with that group and assumes that I have all of the traits that are characteristic of it. (e) Lying. It is difficult to say how many of the falsehoods told about me are conscious lies. At least some of the things that my brother and my mother have said are conscious lies and not honest errors, and I can identify one other individual who definitely has been lying about me. But otherwise my guess is that conscious lying *by informants* has not played an important role, ^{it is a matter, instead, of} human fallibility and irrationality. On the other hand, some conscious lies by journalists can be clearly identified, and there is enough evidence of unscrupulousness and irresponsibility in the media to make it plausible that journalists may often lie when they think they won't get caught, *or it makes for a livelier story.*

Apart from the factors we've just listed there are four others that may have helped to produce false reports in my case, but their existence is more-or-less speculative and cannot be definitely proved. These are: (f) Projection. People who themselves have mental or psychological problems are prone to see others as having such problems. *makes more sense (to me)* (g) Personal resentment or jealousy. This factor is clearly present in the case of my brother and mother. In some other individuals its presence may be suspected, but this is speculative. (h) Mass hysteria, herd instinct. Under certain conditions, when an individual or a class of individuals within a society is pointed out as evil or worthy of being cast out, an atmosphere develops in which other members of the society draw together defensively, gang up on the rejected person(s), and take satisfaction in reviling him or them. It becomes something like a fad. *Possibly sadistic*

can be found in the mix

impulses are involved. Some such factor seems to be operating in my case, ² but it is ² difficult to prove this objectively. (I) Greed. Several people who once knew me have appeared on television in connection with my case, and ² (I assume that) they have been ^(I know) paid for it. Obviously, those who told the most bizarre or exaggerated stories about me would be most in demand by talk shows and therefore would make the most money. When interviewed later by my investigators, they would ^{of course feed} give them the same story that they gave on television so as not to have to admit to themselves or ^{anyone else} others that they had ^{stet} ~~let~~ ~~stet~~ allowed their memories to be warped by greed.

Now some examples:

(a) *Media planting.* There are very many instances in which I am reasonably sure that this has occurred, ^{18/} but often I can't prove it definitely. For example, Leroy Weinberg, a neighbor of ours when I was a teenager, told investigators that when he said "hello" to me I always failed to respond. ^{17/} I know that this is false, because my mother had ² ~~me~~ well trained to be polite to adults, and that included answering all greetings from them. ^{18/} It seems fairly obvious that Weinberg attributes this and other strange behavior to me because his memory of me has been warped by exposure to the media, ² but how can I be certain? ² ~~Conceivably~~ he might remember some instance in which I failed to respond to a greeting of his because I simply didn't hear it.

² However, ² there are ^{other} some cases in which it does seem virtually certain that media planting has been at work.

Dr. L.Hz., a dentist who practices part of the time in Lincoln, Montana, told my investigators: "Ted must not have had much money because his mother usually paid

his dental bills." ^{19/} My mother had provided me with a large sum of money from which I paid my dental bills among other things, but she never paid any of my dental bills directly. I deposited her money in a bank and paid Dr. L.Hz. either in cash or with checks on my own account. There is no way that Dr. L.Hz. could have known that the money came ultimately from my mother, because I was embarrassed about the fact I received money from her, and I was careful to conceal it from everyone. Certainly I would never have told Dr. L.Hz. about it. It is clear, therefore, that Dr. L.Hz. must have learned from the media after my arrest that I had been receiving money from my mother, and this information altered his memory of his own dealings with me.

Dr. L.Hz. also told my investigators: "Ted was an extremely quiet person, so quiet that Ted appeared odd. Ted was a kooky man" ^g . . . ^[He] Ted did not talk much." ^{19/} Media planting was probably involved here, too, as Dr. L.Hz.'s account is contradicted by that of his own dental assistant, R.Cb. According to my investigators, R.Cb. "described Ted as, 'a sweet, nice, pleasant guy'" ^g . . . She said that Ted was 'friendly' and she would chat with him when he came into the office. She does not remember what they talked about." ^{20/} Dr. L.Hz. was present at most of my conversations with R.Cb. and he participated in them.

Another clear example of media planting is provided by Dale Eickelman, whom I knew in junior high and high school. Eickelman, now a professor at Dartmouth College, told my investigators that "Teddie did not have other friends ² [than Dale Eickelman] during the time that Dale knew Teddie from 5th grade until Teddie's sophomore year [of college]." ^{21/} In Chapter III of this book (pp. 79, 87, 88) I mention eight people (other

than Dale Eickelman), of approximately my own age or up to two years older, with whom I was friends during some part (or in one case almost all) of the period between fifth grade and the time I left high school. ^{22/} These were good friends whom I genuinely liked, not just casual acquaintances or people (like Russell Mosny) with whom I spent time only because we were thrown together as outcasts.

Professor Eickelman is a highly intelligent man. He must realize that his house was at least a mile and a half from mine, and that after fifth grade we were never in any of the same classes at school. So how can he imagine that he knows whether I had any friends other than himself? The only evidence he cited was that when he visited my house (which was not very often) no other friends were present. ^{23/} But it was equally true that when I visited Eickelman's house he never had any other friends there.

Would this justify me in concluding that ^{I was} his only friend ~~was myself~~?

Professor Eickelman's belief that he was my only friend clearly has no rational basis. Only one plausible explanation for this belief presents itself. It was suggested to him by the media portrayal of me as abnormally asocial. It is true that I was unsuccessful socially in junior high and high school. Thus the media did not create Professor Eickelman's belief from nothing, but caused him to exaggerate grossly the accurate perception that I was less social than the average kid.

(b) *Mistaken identity*. In Chapter VI the reader will find several examples of mistaken identity: cases in which it can be clearly shown that an informant has made a false statement about me because he has confused me with someone else. We give another example here.

where I lived in Lincoln, Montana

G.Wi. owns a cabin not far from mine, ⁸though I haven't seen him for several years. According to investigators who interviewed him, "[G.Wi.] thinks that Ted was always looking over his shoulder. Sometime during the 1970's, Ted talked to [G.Wi.] about the KGB. Ted told [G.Wi.] he had a place he could hide in up [sic] Old Baldy where no one would ever find him." ^{24/}

G.Wi. has me mixed up with Al Pinkston, a gentleman whom ^{both} he and I met up in ^(which? - memory pt.) the Dalton Mountain or Sauerkraut Creek area ⁱⁿ about late December of 1974. Pinkston (now deceased) was an obvious paranoiac who believed that the Lincoln area was infested with KGB agents. He told me he was hiding out up on the mountain because ^{# were} "they're gunnin' for ^{his} my ass." I related the story of this encounter three months later in my journal ^(25/) and in a letter to my parents. ^(28/) combine nts.

I never told G.Wi. or anyone else that I had a hiding place. ✓

In this and in some other cases of mistaken identity, it is likely that media influence was at work. G.Wi. probably confused me with Al Pinkston because the media had portrayed me as crazy, like Pinkston.

Recent memory

(c) Remembering later years. In greater or lesser degree this phenomenon seems to affect a number of the reports made to my investigators by people who have known me. In some cases it is clear-cut. For example, Russell Mosny reported that he and I met through our membership in the high school band, ^{27/} but actually I knew him from the time I entered seventh grade. ^{28/}

In some cases it is difficult to disentangle the effect of "remembering later years" from that of "media planting." Thus L.D., the daughter of one of my father's best

friends, told investigators: "Ted Jr. was a very shy and quiet boy. He was introverted and only involved himself in things he could do alone."^{29/} Here and throughout her

interview, L.D. exaggerates my shyness and introversion to the point of caricature.

Most likely ² this ^{may be} is the result of media planting, ^{but his most recent memories of me} Yet "remembering later years" would

also seem to be involved ² too, since L.D. appears to have forgotten completely the earlier years when I was not particularly shy or introverted and we were lively playmates. I wrote the following in 1979:

"I might have been about 9 years old when the following incident occurred. My family was visiting the Do I family. The D I's had a little girl named L I, about my own age. At that time she was very pretty. I was horsing around with her, and by and by I got to tickling her. I put my arms around her from behind and tickled her under the ribs. I tickled and tickled, and she squirmed and laughed. I pressed my body up against hers, and experienced a very pleasant, warm, affectionate sensation, distinctly sexual. Unfortunately, my mother caught on to the fact that our play was beginning to take on a sexual character. She got embarrassed and told me to stop tickling L I. L I said, 'No, don't make him stop! I like it!' but, alas, my mother insisted, and I had to quit."^{30/}

example of the distortions caused by recent memories

The most important case of "remembering later years" involves my father's close friend Ralph Meister. On February 2, 1997 Dr. Meister signed for my investigators a declaration in which he outlined what he knew about me and my family life. The declaration is mostly accurate except in one respect. Dr. Meister represents my mother and me as showing certain traits through the entire period of my childhood and

adolescence, whereas in reality those traits were not shown until I was approaching adolescence. Thus, he writes: "Wanda put pressure on Teddy John to be an intellectual giant almost from the day he was born." ^{31/} Actually I never felt I was under much pressure to achieve until at least the age of eleven. Dr. Meister also implies that I had difficulties with social adjustment from early childhood, ^{32/} whereas in reality those difficulties did not begin until much later. All this will be shown in Chapters I through V of this book.

(d) *Stereotyping*: The most clear-cut example of this ^{would be} is that some people remember me as having used a pocket protector in high school. ^{33/} I have never used a pocket protector in my life. But because I was identified with the "Briefcase Boys" (academically-oriented students) and because some of these did wear pocket protectors, people remember me as having worn one too.

(e) *Lying*: Except for my brother and my mother, the one ^{person who has} informant whom I ^{and quite} definitely ^{lied} know to be consciously lying is Chris Waits of Lincoln, Montana. Waits has been pretending that he knew me well. ^{34/} He used to say hello to me when he passed me on the road in his truck, and I would return his greeting. I don't remember ever accepting a ride from him, but it's conceivable that I may have done so on one or two ^{nt. You} occasions, not more. Apart from that I had no association or contact with him ^{Should mention} that CW is a logge whatsoever.

One wonders what Waits's motive might be. Perhaps he is one of those pathetic individuals who feel like failures in life and try to compensate by seeking notoriety through tall tales that they tell about some news event that has come close to them. I

recall that back in the 1950^s there was a derelict in Chicago named Benny Bedwell who "confessed" to a highly publicized murder just in order to make himself famous.

(f) *Projection*. It does appear to be true that ^{people}persons who themselves have mental or psychological problems are prone to see others as having such problems, but it is difficult to say definitely that this factor has operated in my case, since the people who portrayed me as strange, abnormal, or mentally ill may have done so under the influence of "media planting" or some other factor. ^{for personal reasons} But it is a fact that many of the people who portrayed me in this way had ^{serious}problems of their own. For the case of Joel Schwartz see Chapter XII and Appendix 6. Many other examples can be found in the investigators' reports of the interviews that they conducted.^{35/} Here I will only discuss some of my suitemates from Eliot ^{House}N-43 at Harvard who gave false information about me.

W.Pr., Pat McIntosh, John Masters, and K.M. formed a close-knit clique within the suite. To all outward appearances they were thoroughly well-adjusted. They wore neatly-kept suits and ties, their rooms were always tidy, they observed all of the expected social amenities, their attitudes, opinions, speech, and behavior were so conventional that I found them completely uninteresting. Yet three of the four gave my investigators a glimpse of their psychological problems.

Pat McIntosh, according to the investigators' report, did a great deal of whining throughout his interview about how hard it was to survive academically and psychologically at Harvard. For example: "[Pat] found life at Harvard to be extremely difficult . . . ^{36/} Patrick [had] his own adolescent insecurities . . . ^{37/} Patrick was too

insecure and wrapped up in his own problems . . . ^{38/} The faculty or administration at Harvard was . . . unconcerned with students' emotional and psychological problems. Patrick did not know any students who actually sought and received emotional help . . . At times, Patrick wanted help surviving himself, but he had no idea where to go. John Finley, the house master . . . didn't want to recognize the serious difficulties that many of the students were having." ^{39/}

McIntosh evidently assumes that I was having problems similar to his own: "One day during Patrick's second year at Harvard . . . he saw a student being taken out on a stretcher. The student had slit his wrists after receiving a C on an exam . . . Patrick . . . thought of Ted and worried that maybe Ted might end up like this kid." ^{39/}

John Masters told the investigators that he "was two years old when the United States dropped the atomic bomb on Nagasaki and Hiroshima. After the bombing, he used to dream about the atomic bomb; these dreams sparked John's fantasies of becoming a nuclear physicist but after he barely earned a C in his freshman physics class at Harvard, he decided that he was not cut out for a career in the hard sciences. ² . . . ^{40/} During John's first semester of his sophomore year at Harvard, his family began to fall apart. He became very depressed for several months and started receiving therapy at the student health services". ^{41/}

When John Masters first moved into Eliot ^{House} N-43 he mentioned having been in "the hospital." I asked him what he had been in the hospital for, and he answered, "just nervousness." Like McIntosh, Masters ^{has made} false statements about me and ^{exaggerated} exaggerates my solitariness. According to the investigators' report of his interview,

"House Master Finley . . . did not intervene on John's behalf when John needed counseling. The same was probably true for Ted. Ted's solitary nature was not enough to draw Master Finley's attention because diversity or unusual behavior was accepted at Harvard. John believes that today Ted's solitary behavior would warrant some type of intervention; at the time, his behavior did not even raise an eyebrow. ^{42/} . . . John's solitary lifestyle meant that he did not make more than five friends while at Harvard." ^{43/}

W.Pr. "was shy and socially backward when he went to Harvard and feared that he would never fully come out of his shell. . . . He had a strong desire to lead a normal life. [W.Pr.] was an astronomy major. He originally intended to pursue astronomy on the graduate level but his fears drove him away from that goal. He saw that many of the astronomy graduate students at Harvard were not well-adjusted and he felt he would move further away from a normal life if he pursued astrophysics.

"At the end of [W.Pr.'s] junior year, he dropped out of Harvard. He was confused as a college student and this confusion led him to drop out of school. [W.Pr.] went to the Harvard health services for counseling before dropping out of Harvard. He thought the counseling was helpful . . . he returned to Harvard a year or two later. [W.Pr.] did not last long at Harvard and soon dropped out again." ^{44/}

W.Pr. too made false statements about me and exaggerated my solitariness. "[W.Pr.] and the others at N-43 were too young to realize how serious Ted's isolation was for him" ^{45/}

Thus McIntosh, Masters, and W.Pr. appear to have seen me as having problems or needs that were, in part, similar to their own. In reality I was psychologically self-

reliant and felt neither insecure, nor depressed, nor did I feel in need of help, nor did I find it hard to face the academic challenges of Harvard. Nor did I feel troubled by loneliness. I did suffer from acute sexual starvation: I was in daily contact with smart, physically attractive Radcliffe women and I didn't know how to make advances to them. I did feel very frustrated at a few mathematics teachers whose lectures I considered to be ill-prepared. Apart from that there was just one other thing about which I felt seriously unhappy: It was a kind of nagging malaise the nature of which I never fully understood until I broke free of it once and for all in 1966. But that is a story that will be told elsewhere than in this book.

(g) *Personal resentment or jealousy.* Only in the case of my brother and mother can resentment or jealousy be clearly identified as a factor influencing reports given to investigators. However, this factor may be suspected in some other cases. Ellen A. (see Chapter VI) once told me that "everyone" was jealous of me, presumably referring to the people whom we both knew, including G.Da. and Russell Mosny, both of whom seemed to become cool toward me at about the time I moved a year ahead of them in school. In G.Da.'s opinion, "Academically and intellectually, Ted was head and shoulders above the rest of the students at Evergreen Park High. His exceptional intelligence set him apart, even from a group of bright young men like the Briefcase Boys." ^{46/} "The Briefcase Boys" was a clique that included, among others, G.Da., Russell Mosny, and Roger Podewell. According to Podewell, "It wasn't just Ted's shyness that set him apart from the Briefcase Boys. He was more intelligent than the others, a fact that made Roger a little jealous" ^{47/} G.Da. and Mosny both went to

the University of Illinois and flunked out. Roger Podewell went to Yale and got a C average his first year. (How he did after that I don't know.) I did not fail to josh Podewell and Mosny about their academic performance, but they didn't seem to find it amusing.

G.Da., Podewell, and Mosny (especially the last) gave my investigators unflattering and inaccurate accounts of me that exaggerated my social isolation. Is this due only to media planting or are dislike, resentment, or jealousy also involved? My guess is that no such factor is involved in Podewell's case but that it is involved in Mosny's. With G.Da. it could be either way.

"Patrick [McIntosh] was jealous of Ted's prowess in mathematics" ^{39/} Did this influence McIntosh's highly inaccurate and unflattering portrayal of me? There is no proof that it did. But it's a fact that a sense of inferiority can be one of the most powerful impulses to resentment. Especially when the person who appears to be more able is lacking in tact, as I'm afraid has sometimes been the case with me.

(h) *Mass hysteria, Herd instinct*: This is a very vaguely-defined factor that has probably been at work in my case, but it is impossible to separate from media planting or illustrate with specific examples.

(I) *Greed*. I have no way of proving that people who told stories about me on television allowed themselves to alter their recollections in such a way as to make them more profitable financially. But it is worth noting that two of the people who appeared most on talk shows — Russell Mosny and Pat McIntosh — gave my investigators accounts of me that were among the most exaggerated and inaccurate.

Let us conclude with a few more examples that show the inaccuracy of the reports made to investigators by people who have known me.

My brother used to hold literary "colloquia," as he called them. He and a few friends would all read some piece of literature that one of them had selected, then they would get together and discuss it. The participants varied, but the most usual ones were my brother, my parents, Dale Es., and K.H. and Jeanne En. ^{48/} I attended one and only one of these colloquia. This was shortly after I arrived at my parents' home in Lombard, Illinois in 1978. To the investigators Dale Es. described my behavior at this colloquium as follows:

"On the first occasion Dale met Ted, Wanda and Ted Sr. [my father], Dave and he were discussing Plato, in connection with something they had read in their book club. Ted came out of his room and said there was no reason to read any early Greek philosophers like Plato because they had all been proven wrong. That was all Ted said before returning to his room or leaving the house. . . . [Ted] never made eye contact, but just looked off blindly while he spoke." ^{49/} extract

Here is how Jeanne En. described my behavior at the same colloquium:

"[Jeanne met Ted] one night when she and K.H. were back at the Kaczynskis' house for another colloquy [sic]. When he was introduced to her, Ted made a disparaging comment about her and about women in general. She was completely shocked, but the nature of Ted's comment made her feel that there was no point in trying to get to know Ted. Later, when the group began the colloquy Ted participated at first, but Jeanne recalls that he soon disagreed with something in the discussion. He

then became nervous and fidgety and kept getting up, walking out and coming back to the conversation." 50/

The reader will observe that the two accounts are inconsistent with ^{each other} ~~one another~~.
At least one of them must be false.

As a matter of fact, both are false. I remember the colloquium quite clearly. The participants were Dale Es., K.H. and Jeanne En., my parents, my brother, and myself. I can state exactly where each of us was sitting, ^{also} I can describe in a general way the demeanor of each, and I can even recall some of the details of the conversation. The subject of the colloquium was a dialogue of Plato that discussed happiness and love; Plato's conclusion was that true happiness lay in the love of wisdom.

I was present in the living room when the others entered. I did not make a

disparaging comment about Jeanne personally. I did not make a disparaging comment

about women in general when I was introduced to Jeanne, ² but ³ it is conceivable that at

some later point I may have made a ³ ~~disparaging~~ comment about woman that might have been felt

^{whether} or not it was ³ ~~disparaging~~ is ² a matter of interpretation. ²
as ² ~~disparaging~~ by a woman who was excessively sensitive about her gender. However,

² it's more likely that Jeanne is remembering a half-humorous comment about women

that I made in a letter to her husband, K.H., during the early or mid-1980's. ² (Added July

² 20, 1998: Since writing the foregoing, I've obtained copies of some of my letters to K.H.

² En., including the letter mentioned here. This undated letter refers jokingly to "Woman,

the vessel of evil." ² X

I did not say that the early Greek philosophers had "been proven wrong." I did
say that their methods of reasoning were naive by modern standards, hence they were

worth reading today only for esthetic reasons or because of their historical interest, not as a source of rational understanding.

I did not become "nervous" or "fidgety", and I did not leave the room at any time until all of the guests had left. I did repeatedly get up ^{for more} to take pieces of snack food ² from ² a bowl that was on a table five or six feet from where I was sitting. It is probably some garbled memory of this that ^{led} leads Jeanne to say that I kept getting up and walking out.

Dale Es.'s statement that I "never made eye contact" with him is literally true, but it was he, not I, who avoided eye contact. I looked at Dale Es.'s face a number of times during the evening, but he never looked back at me. ^{It might be amusing} I'm more than willing to put the matter to a test. I invite Mr. Es. to come and visit me in the presence of witnesses. Let the witnesses judge which of us has difficulty maintaining eye contact with the other.

Besides his evasion of eye contact, Dale Es. seemed unable to deal with any challenge to his opinions. Twice during the evening I made so bold as to disagree with him. In each case, instead of answering my argument, he ² just shut his mouth, elevated his nose ⁹ and looked away without saying ^{a word} anything.

K.H. En. didn't give the investigators ^{an} any account of my behavior at the colloquium, or at least none is mentioned in the report that I have. He did have much ² else to say about me, ^{although the majority of it was pure} however, and it is mostly fantasy. Unfortunately, no documents are available that confirm or refute his statements except in one case. According to the investigators' report of their interview with K.H. and Jeanne,

in-in
, extract

"[K.H.] and Jeanne compared Ted to Jeanne's brother Dan who was severely mentally ill and killed himself in 1984. In fact, Dave [Kaczynski] also knew Dan and saw

a clear parallel between Dan and Ted. Dan had extremely rigid opinions and was often intolerant and impatient of divergent views. . . . Dave, in fact, found Dan and Ted so similar that when Dan finally killed himself in 1984, he began to worry that Ted might do the same." ^{51/}

But here is what my brother wrote to me in 1984, shortly after Dan's suicide:

"I've been feeling kind of depressed the last couple of weeks since learning that Jeanne's brother Dan committed suicide. As he lived with [K.H.] and Jeanne, and didn't have a regular job, I spent quite a bit of time with him during my two visits in Rockport. We . . . often talked about philosophy. . . .

"[I]t was hard getting through to Dan. On the other hand, he seemed to have a message he was trying to get across, and which he didn't feel that I, [K.H.], or anyone had yet appreciated adequately. So he must have felt a similar frustration with us, in answer to which, according to [K.H.], he seemed to be withdrawing from everyone more and more during the last couple of years. [K.H.] seemed to think that Dan's suicide was a 'rational act' -- i.e. that it was a consequence of his ideas. The arresting thing for would-be intellectuals, such as [K.H.] and me, assuming this were true, is the facility and resolution with which Dan's 'idea' translated itself into an act. [K.H.] . . . is even worse than me, living a beourgeois [sic] life-style in almost all respects except his reading.

". . . When I spoke to [K.H.] on the phone, he still sounded unusually distraught. If Dan had intended at all to make a permanent, life-long impression on [K.H.] -- to break through the barrier of mere philosophizing at last -- then I think he might have

succeeded. The rest of the family prefers -- I suppose for obvious reasons -- to interpret Dan's later years and his suicide as symptoms of a mental disease. . . . [Dan's death] reminded me of the sometimes dismal gulfs which isolate human beings from one another. It reminded me just a tad of myself, having ideas and affections, but often feeling at a loss for the proper means to share them. More acutely, I felt somewhat guilty, as if I were being called to account for my unresponsiveness to similar claims made on me by others." ^{52/}

In his interview K.H. goes on and on about my supposed "intolerance" of other people's ideas (making, at the same time, many false statements about my behavior).^{53/} As a matter of fact, I never had more than a ^{handful of} very little philosophical or intellectual discussion ^s with K.H., ^{and although} but (though I was not knowingly tactless) ^g that little (apparently was) ^h ^{prove} enough to show him that I did not respect him or his ideas, which presumably is why he thought I was "intolerant." If the reader were to make K.H.'s acquaintance and become familiarize ^{-d} ² himself with his ideas, he would be able to make his own judgment as to whether my lack of respect for them was due to intolerance or to the quality of the ^{common sense} ideas. ²

K.H. used to read children's comic books and claimed that he found philosophical messages in them. ^{54/} I once asked him whether he believed the messages were put there intentionally or whether he ^{had somehow tricked them} created them himself out of the comic-book material. He answered that he preferred not to discuss the question at that time.

*

*

Among many other inaccuracies that appear in Professor Peter Duren's interview with the investigators, there is the following:

"The last time that Professor Duren ever saw Ted was at the annual meeting of the American Math Society in San Francisco in 1968. Ted did not give a talk which was strange since professionally it was the right thing to do. Professor Duren saw Ted standing near the escalator. He went over to talk to Ted, and they had a very stiff, very brief conversation. The conversation consisted of Professor Duren asking questions that Ted did not feel like answering. Ted did not seem comfortable or happy." ^{55/}

an invention

This may be a case of mistaken identity or it may be just fantasy. I was not a member of the American Mathematical Society in 1968 and I have never in my life attended any kind of mathematical meeting outside of a university where I was a

~~was never~~

student or faculty member. I just wasn't that interested in mathematics. I suppose the names of participants in American Mathematical Society meetings are recorded, and if that is so, then it may be possible to ^{prove} get documentary proof that I was not at the 1968 meeting, ^{for what it is worth} but at present I am not able to provide such proof.

*

people

A few ~~persons~~ ^{people} reported that in high school I was once stuffed in a locker by some "tough" kids and left there. ^{56/} If this had ever happened, it wouldn't be the kind of thing I would be likely to forget. Nor would I conceal it, ^{of} I ^{certainly} ^{far more} reported other ~~humiliating~~ incidents in my 1979 autobiography, so why conceal this one? I'd guess that a combination of media planting and mistaken identity are involved here. Ray Janz, who told the story in the media, ^{58/} probably had me mixed up with someone else. Others ^e

who knew that *some* student had been stuffed in a locker/⁹heard Janz's story through the media and subsequently "remembered" that I was the victim.

*

In reference to my brother's years at Evergreen Park High School, Dale Es. (who was one of Dave's teachers there) told the investigators:

"Physically, . . . Dave was much smaller than his classmates. He was also socially awkward. Dave was shy and quiet and tended to keep to himself. Dale never saw Dave hanging out with friends. . . . [S]ocially and physically, he was behind [his classmates]. . . . Dave seemed socially and physically awkward." ^{57/}

Referring to the early 1970's, Dale Es. said:

"Dave was still socially awkward and inept. . . . [W]hen Dale and Dave went for walks in the Morton Arboretum, Dave made Dale walk ahead of him so that Dave did not have to speak to any people they passed. He told Dale he did not want to have to say hello to people." ^{58/}

Lois Skillen, guidance counselor at the school, described my brother during his high school years as follows:

"David was outgoing, friendly and sociable. . . . David had friends and played sports. . . . David was outgoing and happy. . . . David . . . sat down in the living room with all the women and immediately started to chat with them. David was laughing and having a good time. He was sweet, friendly and social." ^{59/}

The admirable consistency between Dale Es.'s description of my brother and Miss Skillen's should help the reader to estimate the value of these reports. ✓

As it turns out,

Much of the information that Skillen gave my investigators is inaccurate, but on this particular point she is right and Dale Es. is wrong. My brother ^{was} is occasionally a little shy, and he wasn't socially polished, but he never had any trouble making friends. In high school, if anything, he was more outgoing than he was later. I don't have Dave's medical records, but they would probably show that he was at least average height for his age. Anyone who thinks Dave is physically awkward will soon change his mind if he plays tennis or ping-pong with him. The Morton Arboretum incident may well have occurred, since my brother occasionally behaves a little oddly. But it does not fairly represent his usual social behavior.

* * * * *

It is interesting that there seems to be little relation between the intelligence of an ~~interviewee~~ ^{interviewer / word choice} informant and the accuracy of the reports that he gives about decades-old events.

We've seen that an adequate university professor like Dr. Duren and an outstanding one like Dr. Eickelman ^{60/} were among those who gave grossly inaccurate accounts of my early years. Yet some people of modest intellectual attainments have ^{also} given accounts that are fairly accurate. I suppose it's a matter of character. Some people refrain from speaking when they aren't sure, whereas others find it difficult to control themselves and resort to fantasy. their fantasies.

I've shown that several factors have operated in producing false reports about me, but I have little doubt that media planting is the most important one. The fact that have warped or distorted memories of me so many people's memories of me have been warped as badly as they have been shows the awesome power of propaganda.

Scientific American recently published an interesting article on memory-
planting.^{61/} The phenomenon is not hypothetical; its existence has been proved.

This book deals only with the way I have been misrepresented by my family and
by the media. It is true that But the FBI, the prosecutors, and the shrinks have misrepresented me
but that is for another time.
just as badly, and I expect to take them on in some later writing.